



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,421	08/19/2003	Clifton W. Laney	P17352	4529
28062 7590 02/19/2008 BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR LLC 50 LOCUST AVENUE NEW CANAAN, CT 06840			EXAMINER VU, KIEU D	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

FEB 19 2008

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/643421
Filing Date: August 19, 2003
Appellant(s): LANEY, CLIFTON W. et al

Patrick J. Buckley
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11/21/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 05/18/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,504,534	Takase	01-2003
20030005193	Seroussi	01-2003
2001/0020928	Yanagisawa et al	09-2001

6,961,034	Kusanagi et al	11-2005
-----------	----------------	---------

5,805,163	Bagnas	09-1998
-----------	--------	---------

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 24 - 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase and Seroussi et al ("Seroussi", US 20030005193).

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534) and Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928).

Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534), Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928), and Seroussi et al ("Seroussi", US 20030005193).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534), Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928), and Kusanagi et al ("Kusanagi", US 6,961,034).

Claims 16, 19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bagnas (US 5,805,163) and Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928).

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bagnas (US 5,805,163), Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928), Kusanagi et al ("Kusanagi", US 6,961,034).

The detailed rejections are as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 24 - 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534).

Regarding claim 24, Takase teaches a method and apparatus comprising:
determining that a display unit is to be in an off state (no input signal is received from the external input device for a prescribed period of time) (col. 5, lines 7-19, lines 40-46); and arranging for an opaque graphical user interface window to be created in the random access memory unit responsive to the determination (homogeneous black picture image is created and displayed) (see col. 2, lines 8-16) (col. 10, lines 38-48).

Regarding claim 25, Takase teaches wherein the opaque window occupies substantially all of a graphical user interface area (screen saver occupies substantially screen area) (col. 6, lines 1-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase and Seroussi et al ("Seroussi", US 20030005193).

Regarding claim 26, Takase does not teach wherein a plurality of windows may co-exist in the graphical user interface and the opaque window is created such that it would be displayed on top of other windows. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Seroussi. Seroussi teaches a security system wherein a screen saver is displayed on top of other windows (the screen saver covers any material on the display, [0022]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Takase and Seroussi before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying an opaque window (black screen) upon detecting inactivity taught by Takase to include having a screen saver cover any material on the display taught by Seroussi with the motivation being to secure displayed information in order to enhance the system security.

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534) and Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928).

Regarding claim 1, Takase teaches a method and apparatus comprising: determining that a display unit is to be in an off state (no input signal is received from the external input device for a prescribed period of time) (col. 5, lines 7-19, lines 40-46); and arranging for an opaque graphical user interface window to be created in a graphics memory unit in response to the determination (homogeneous black picture image is created and displayed) (see col. 2, lines 8-16) (col. 10, lines 38-48). Takase fails to teach that the off state is the state wherein the display unit has transitioned from a higher power state to a power off. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Yanagisawa. Yanagisawa teaches that when a signal during the power turning turned off is inputted, a black image is displayed ([0032], [0033]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Takase and Yanagisawa before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying an opaque window (black screen) upon detecting inactivity taught by Takase to include displaying a black image when the power is turned off taught by Yanagisawa with the motivation being to prevent the turbulence of images in the LDC in Takase's system (Yanagisawa, [0002]).

Regarding claim 10, Takase teaches an apparatus, comprising: an input to receive an indication that a display unit is to be in an off state (no input signal is received from the external input device for a prescribed period of time) (col. 5, lines 7-19, lines 40-46); and a device to arrange for an opaque graphical user interface window to be created in a graphics memory unit in response to the received indication (homogeneous black picture image is created and displayed) (see col. 2, lines 8-16)

(col. 10, lines 38-48) (Fig. 6-7). Takase fails to teach that the off state is the state wherein the display unit has transitioned from a higher power state to a power off. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Yanagisawa. Yanagisawa teaches that when a signal during the power turning turned off is inputted, a black image is displayed ([0032], [0033]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Takase and Yanagisawa before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying an opaque window (black screen) upon detecting inactivity taught by Takase to include displaying a black image when the power is turned off taught by Yanagisawa with the motivation being to prevent the turbulence of images in the LDC in Takase's system (Yanagisawa, [0002]).

Regarding claims 2 and 11, Takase teaches wherein the opaque window occupies substantially all of a graphical user interface area (screen saver occupies substantially screen area) (col. 6, lines 1-9).

Regarding claims 4 and 13, Takase teaches wherein the off state is associated with a system's low-power state (col. 3, lines 16-25).

Regarding claim 6, Takase teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said determining is based on a period of relative inactivity (no input signal is received from the external input device for a prescribed period of time) (col. 5, lines 7-19, lines 40-46). Yanagisawa teaches determining automatic power transition of the display unit (Yanagisawa, [0032]-[0033]).

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Takase teaches wherein the display unit is associated with at least one of: (i) a desktop personal computer; (ii) a mobile system, (iii) a workstation, (iv) a server, (v) a set top box, and (vi) a game system (see Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 9, Takase teaches wherein at least one of said determining and said arranging is associated with at least one of: (i) a software application, (ii) a hardware device, (iii) an operating system, (iv) a driver, and (v) a basic input/output system (col. 3, lines 16-25, lines 38-50).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Takase does not teach determining that the display unit has transitioned back to the higher power state and arranging for the opaque window to be removed from the graphics memory unit. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Yanagisawa. Yanagisawa teaches upon detecting power being turned on, black image display is removed and normal video display is executed ([0040]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Takase and Yanagisawa before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying an opaque window (black screen) upon detecting inactivity taught by Takase to include removing black image display upon detecting that power is transitioned to higher state taught by Yanagisawa with the motivation being to enable Takase's system to display user's screen so that the user can easily and quickly resume his/her activity on the screen.

6. Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534), Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928), and Seroussi et al ("Seroussi", US 20030005193).

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Takase in view of Yanagisawa does not teach wherein a plurality of windows may co-exist in the graphical user interface and the opaque window is created such that it would be displayed from the graphics memory unit on top of other windows. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Seroussi. Seroussi teaches a security system wherein a screen saver is displayed from the graphics memory unit on top of other windows (the screen saver covers any material on the display, [0022]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Takase, Yanagisawa, and Seroussi before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying an opaque window (black screen) upon detecting inactivity taught by Takase and Yanagisawa to include having a screen saver cover any material on the display taught by Seroussi with the motivation being to secure displayed information in order to enhance the system security.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takase et al ("Takase", US 6,504,534), Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928), and Kusanagi et al ("Kusanagi", US 6,961,034).

Regarding claim 5, Takase in view of Yanagisawa does not teach wherein said determining comprises: receiving from a user a request to turn off the display unit. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Kusanagi. Kusanagi teaches a display device for preventing an occurrence of afterimage, the device further comprises detecting user's request to turn off the display unit (col. 7, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Takase and

Kusanagi before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying an opaque window (black screen) upon detecting inactivity taught by Takase to include detecting user's request to turn off the display unit taught by Kusanagi with the motivation being to provide the user with the ability to control the display of opaque window (black window).

8. Claims 16, 19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bagnas (US 5,805,163) and Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928).

Regarding claim 16, Bagnas teaches a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that when executed by a machine result in the following: displaying a first window of a graphical user interface operating system on a display unit (window 28), displaying a second window (window 30) of the operating system on the display unit, wherein the second window is displayed over the first window, performing calculations to make the second window semi-transparent, such that a faded image of the first window is visible to a user through the second window (Fig. 6A). Bagnas does not teach determining that the display unit has transitioned from a power on state to a power off state, and responsive to the transition, arranging for a third window of the operating system to be automatically created wherein the third window is opaque and occupies substantially all of a graphical user interface area such that neither the first nor second window would be visible to a user and said calculations are no longer performed. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Yanagisawa. Yanagisawa teaches that when a signal during the power turning turned off is inputted, a black image

display (third opaque window) is covered the LCD display ([0032], [0033]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Bagnas and Yanagisawa before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying multiple windows taught by Bagnas to include displaying a black image when the power is turned off taught by Yanagisawa with the motivation being to prevent the turbulence of images in the LDC in Bagnas' system (Yanagisawa, [0002]).

Regarding claim 19, Bagnas in view of Yanagisawa teaches that the off state is associated with a system's low-power state (Yanagisawa's power off, [0033])

Regarding claim 21, Bagnas does not teach determining that the display unit has transitioned back to the power on state and arranging for the third window to be removed and resuming said calculations to make the second window semi-transparent. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Yanagisawa. Yanagisawa teaches upon detecting power being turned on, black image display is removed and normal video display is executed ([0040]) (normal video display in Bagnas will show windows in Fig. 6A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Bagnas and Yanagisawa before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying multiple windows taught by Bagnas to include removing black image display upon detecting that power is transitioned to higher state taught by Yanagisawa with the motivation being to enable Bagnas' system to display user's screen so that the user can easily and quickly resume his/her activity on the screen.

Regarding claim 22, Bagnas teaches wherein the display unit is associated with at least one of: (i) a desktop personal computer; (ii) a mobile system, (iii) a workstation, (iv) a server, (v) a set top box, and (vi) a game system (see Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 23, Bagnas in view of Yanagisawa teaches wherein at least one of said determining and said arranging is associated with at least one of: (i) a software application, (ii) a hardware device, (iii) an operating system, (iv) a driver, and (v) a basic input/output system (Yanagisawa, [0019]).

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bagnas (US 5,805,163), Yanagisawa et al ("Yanagisawa", US 2001/0020928), Kusanagi et al ("Kusanagi", US 6,961,034).

Regarding claim 20, Bagnas in view of Yanagisawa does not teach wherein said determining comprises: receiving from a user a request to turn off the display unit. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Kusanagi. Kusanagi teaches a display device for preventing an occurrence of afterimage, the device further comprises detecting user's request to turn off the display unit (col. 7, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Bagnas, Yanagisawa, and Kusanagi before him at the time the invention was made, to modify Bagnas and Yanagisawa's system to include detecting user's request to turn off the display unit taught by Kusanagi with the motivation being to provide the user with the ability to control the display of opaque window (black window).

(10) Response to Argument

Claims 24-25

Applicant argues that Takase does not disclose creating an opaque window responsive to a determination that a display unit is to be in an off state. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As described in the specification of the instant application, “a PC might enter a low-power state during a period of relative inactivity and/or when a user turns off a display device” (page 2, lines 3-4), and “the system might automatically place the display unit in the off state during periods of relative inactivity”. Furthermore, Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (Tenth Edition) teaches that “off” can be used as to indicate the suspension of an activity”. As such, “an off state” can be interpreted as a state of inactivity. Takase teaches creating and displaying homogeneous black picture image (opaque window) in response to an inactivity period (off state) (col. 2, lines 8-16) (col. 10, lines 38-48). Therefore, Takase teaches the claimed limitations.

Claim 26

Applicant argues “Neither Seroussi nor Takase, however, disclose or suggest creating such a window “responsive to a determination that a display unit is to be in an off state.” Nor would such a feature even make sense in the system of Seroussi”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As described in the specification of the instant application, “a PC might enter a low-power state during a period of relative inactivity and/or when a user turns off a display device” (page 2, lines 3-4), and “the system might automatically place the display unit in the off state during periods of relative inactivity”. Furthermore, Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (Tenth Edition) teaches that “off”

can be used as to indicate the suspension of an activity". As such, "an off state" can be interpreted as a state of inactivity. Takase teaches creating and displaying homogeneous black picture image (opaque window) in response to an inactivity period (off state) (col. 2, lines 8-16) (col. 10, lines 38-48). Therefore, Takase and Seroussi teach the claimed limitations.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-11, and 13-15

Applicant argues "Takase discloses automatically powering off a display monitor after a screen saver is displayed for a pre-period of time. It does not disclose creating an opaque GUI window "in response" to a determination that a display unit has transitioned to a power off state" and "Yanagisawa does not disclose or suggest creating an opaque GUI window in response to a determination that a display unit has powered off".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees since these arguments attack the references individually. Applicant is reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Takase teaches creating and displaying homogeneous black picture image (opaque window) in response to an inactivity period (col. 2, lines 8-16) (col. 10, lines 38-48). Yanagisawa teaches that when a signal during the power turning turned off is inputted, a black image is displayed ([0032], [0033]). As such, the combination of Takase and Yanagisawa teaches the claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Claims 3 and 12

Applicant argues "None of the references, including Seroussi, disclose or suggest creating such a window "responsive" to a determination that a display unit is to be in an off state." Nor would such a feature even make sense in the system of Seroussi". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As described in the specification of the instant application, "a PC might enter a low-power state during a period of relative inactivity and/or when a user turns off a display device" (page 2, lines 3-4), and "the system might automatically place the display unit in the off state during periods of relative inactivity". Furthermore, Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (Tenth Edition) teaches that "off" can be used as to indicate the suspension of an activity". As such, "an off state" can be interpreted as a state of inactivity. Takase teaches creating and displaying homogeneous black picture image (opaque window) in response to an inactivity period (off state) (col. 2, lines 8-16) (col. 10, lines 38-48).

Claim 5

Applicant argues "Kusanagi merely teaches that a user may power off an LCD display. This, of course, does not suggest creating an opaque GUI window in response to the user powering off the LCD display". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Takase teaches creating and displaying homogeneous black picture image (opaque window) in response to an inactivity period (col. 2, lines 8-16) (col. 10, lines 38-48). Yanagisawa teaches that when a signal during the power turning turned off is inputted, a black image is displayed ([0032], [0033]). Kusanagi teaches a display device for preventing an occurrence of afterimage, the device further comprises detecting user's request to turn off the display unit (col. 7, lines 1-6). As such, the combination of Takase, Yanagisawa, Kusanagi teaches the claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The Supreme Court has held that "a patent for a combination which only unites old elements with no change in their respective functions...obviously withdraws what is already known into the field of its monopoly and diminishes resources available to skillful men...The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely

to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, (U.S. 2007).

"Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle...the fact that a combination was obvious to try might show that it was obvious under section 103." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, (U.S. 2007).

When a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious. *Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.*, 425 U.S. 273 (1976).

Claims 16, 19, and 21-23

Applicant argues "none of the references disclose or suggest creating an opaque GUI window in response to a determination that a display unit has powered off". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bagnas teaches displaying a first window of a graphical user interface operating system on a display unit (window 28), displaying a second window (window 30) of the operating system on the display unit, wherein the second window is displayed over the first window, performing calculations to make the second window semi-transparent, such that a faded image of the first window is visible to a user through the second window (Fig. 6A). Yanagisawa teaches that when a signal during the power turning turned off is inputted, a black image display (third opaque

window) is covered the LCD display ([0032], [0033]). As such, the combination of Bagnas and Yanagisawa teaches the claimed limitations.

Claim 20

Applicant argues "Kusanagi merely teaches that a user may power off an LCD display. This, of course, does not suggest creating an opaque GUI window in response to the user powering off the LCD display". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bagnas teaches displaying a first window of a graphical user interface operating system on a display unit (window 28), displaying a second window (window 30) of the operating system on the display unit, wherein the second window is displayed over the first window, performing calculations to make the second window semi-transparent, such that a faded image of the first window is visible to a user through the second window (Fig. 6A). Yanagisawa teaches that when a signal during the power turning turned off is inputted, a black image display (third opaque window) is covered the LCD display ([0032], [0033]). Kusanagi teaches a display device for preventing an occurrence of afterimage, the device further comprises detecting user's request to turn off the display unit (col. 7, lines 1-6). As such, the combination of Bagnas, Yanagisawa, Kusanagi teaches the claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The Supreme Court has held that "a patent for a combination which only unites old elements with no change in their respective functions...obviously withdraws what is already known into the field of its monopoly and diminishes resources available to skillful men...The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, (U.S. 2007).

"Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle...the fact that a combination was obvious to try might show that it was obvious under section 103." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, (U.S. 2007).

When a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious. *Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.*, 425 U.S. 273 (1976).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Application/Control Number:
10/643,421
Art Unit: 2173

Page 20

Respectfully submitted,

/Kieu D. Vu/
Kieu D. Vu
Primary Examiner

Conferee:



Steven Hong
Supervisory Patent Examiner

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Conferee:

/Lynne H Browne/
Lynne H Browne
Appeal Practice Specialist, TQAS
Technology Center 2100